REMARKS

Pending in the present application are claims 1-3, 5-16, 18-20 and 26-32, of which claims 1 and 16 are independent claims. In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-12, 26 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Arya et al. (U.S. 6,785,094 B2) in view of Sutton et al. (U.S. 5,965,249), claims 16, 18-20 and 27-31 were allowed, and claims 13-15 were objected to as depending from a rejected base claim.

Independent claim 1 is patentable over Arya et al. in view of Sutton et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), because Arya et al. contain no teaching directed to achieving resonance vibration absorption by balancing the stiffness and damping capacity of components in a transducing head suspension, or any specific teaching of a head suspension with a structural damping material having high stiffness and damping capacity (embodied in the claims as a modulus of elasticity greater than approximately 10 gigapascals and a damping capacity greater than approximately 0.02) that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the teachings of Sutton et al.

Arya et al. describe a method of manufacturing all the portions of a disk drive suspension, e.g. load beam, hinge, gimbal, etc., from a single laminate structure. Arya et al. therefore teach a method of producing a suspension without welding or otherwise attaching the separate components of the suspension. *See* Arya et al., col. 2, lines 26-29 ("there is a need for improvement in the design and manufacture of disk drive suspensions ... particularly desirable is a suspension that is substantially, if not completely, weld free in its construction"). The discussion in Arya et al. related to stiffness and damping requirements of disk suspensions teaches nothing specific regarding improving these properties in suspensions. Rather, Arya et al., in teaching a new method of manufacturing a suspension from a single laminate structure simply states what is true of all disk drive suspensions, namely, that they experience loads and vibration conditions which generally necessitate certain material properties. Arya et al. contain no teaching regarding features directed to achieving resonance vibration absorption by balancing the stiffness and damping capacity of specific components in the transducing head, let alone any specific teaching or suggestion of a head suspension including a structural damping material having a modulus of elasticity greater than approximately 10 gigapascals and a damping capacity

greater than approximately 0.02. The Office Action states that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to look to the teachings of Sutton et al. from Arya et al. to improve dynamic loss moduli and achieve sufficient damping capacity across various frequency bands important for disk drive suspensions. However, the only references to damping by Arya et al. are in passing and ancillary to the method of manufacture disclosed, and Arya et al. provide no teaching regarding increasing damping in critical areas of the suspension, e.g. the hinge and gimbal, without sacrificing stiffness to achieve a high stiffness and high damping suspension. Therefore, an ordinarily skilled artisan, at the time the invention was made, would not have been led to the teachings of Sutton et al. from Arya et al., because Arya et al. discloses a method of manufacturing a weld free suspension from a single laminate structure that exhibits common disk drive suspension characteristics. Claims 2, 3, 5-12, 26 and 32 depend from claim 1 and are allowable therewith.

Based on the foregoing remarks, the present application containing claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-16, 18-20 and 26-32 is in condition for allowance, and reconsideration and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: September 2, 2008

By: /Alan M. Koenck/

Alan M. Koenck, Reg. No. 43,724
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 South Third Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002
Telephone: (612) 339-1863
Fax: (612) 339-6580

AMK:TAG